

COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION MINUTES

January 27-28, 2005

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Sacramento, California**

Committee Members Present

Frederick Baker
Lynne Cook
Diane Doe
Dana Griggs
Irma Guzman Wagner
Edward Kujawa
David Madrigal
Karen O'Connor
Ruth Sandlin
Sue Teele
Donna Uyemoto

Staff Members Present

Larry Birch, Administrator
Beth Graybill, Director
Phil Fitch, Consultant
Cheryl Hickey, Consultant
Teri Clark, Consultant
Teri Ackerman, Analyst/Recorder

Committee Members Absent

Lynne Cook 1/28 only
Michael Watenpaugh

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the Committee on Accreditation was called to order by Lynne Cook, Co-Chair, at 9:12 a.m. on Thursday, January 27, 2005.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Co-Chair Lynne Cook reviewed the agenda for the January meeting. It was moved, seconded (Teale/Baker) and carried to approve the agenda as presented.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the October 2004 meeting of the Committee on Accreditation were reviewed. It was moved, seconded (Sandlin/Guzman Wagner) and carried to approve the minutes as corrected.

CO-CHAIR AND MEMBER REPORTS

Diane Doe mentioned that she had attended the most recent meeting of California Council on the Education of Teachers where she served as a keynote speaker. She was introduced and spoke both as a union classroom teacher and as a member of the COA. Her presentation focused on those things which beginning teachers are expected to know and the difficulties involved in meeting new teacher expectations.

Karen O'Connor participated as a member of the selection committee for California Teacher of the Year. Those teachers chosen were honored in Sacramento on January 8, 2005.

STAFF REPORT

Administrator, Larry Birch announced that Cheryl Hickey has taken a new position in the Executive Office, giving support to and assisting the Executive Director. He reassured the COA that Cheryl will continue to work on the accreditation review process. Lynne Cook added that the COA is extremely grateful to Cheryl for work which has already been done as well as that work which still remains to be done.

REPORT OF THE ACCREDITATION VISIT TO CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, DOMINGUEZ HILLS

Larry Birch, Administrator, gave an overview of the merged COA/NCATE accreditation visit to California State University, Dominguez Hills which took place November 13-17, 2004. He introduced Team Leader, Randall Lindsey, who presented the accreditation team report and answered questions. Kathleen Taira, Dean of the School of Education, was present to represent the institution.

It was moved, seconded (Teele/Madriral) and carried (Cook recused) to make the following accreditation decisions for California State University, Dominguez Hills based upon the Accreditation Team Report, team recommendations and staff recommendations:

1. The decision for California State University, Dominguez Hills is ACCREDITATION.

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Administrative Services Credential
 - Preliminary Credential
 - Professional Credential
- Designated Subjects Credential
 - Adult Education

- Education Specialist Credentials – Preliminary Level I and Professional Level II
 - Preliminary Level I
 - Early Childhood Special Education
 - Early Childhood Special Education Internship
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship
 - Professional Level II
 - Early Childhood Special Education
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities
- Multiple Subject Credential
 - Multiple Subject Credential
 - Multiple Subject Internship
 - BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish, Korean, Chinese, Tagalog)
- Pupil Personnel Services Credential
 - School Counseling
 - School Counseling Internship
 - School Psychology
 - School Psychology Internship
 - Child Welfare and Attendance
- Resource Specialist Credential
- Single Subject Credential
 - Single Subject Credential
 - Single Subject Internship
 - BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish, Korean, Chinese, Tagalog)

2. In addition:

- The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted
- California State University, Dominguez Hills is permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
- California State University, Dominguez Hills is placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2011-2012 academic year subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation visits by both the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

PROPOSED CHANGE OF MARCH 2005 MEETING DATE

Larry Birch, Administrator of Accreditation, presented this item to the COA. After reviewing the schedule of meetings adopted previously by the COA, Commission staff and the Co-Chairs realized that the meeting scheduled for March 17, 2005 was scheduled one day after the meeting of the Accreditation Study Workgroup and would not provide sufficient time for the recommendations of the workgroup to be prepared for COA discussion and action.

It was moved, seconded (OConnor/Teele) and carried to change the next meeting date of the Committee on Accreditation from March 17, 2005 to April 21, 2005.

REPORT ON THE ACCREDITATION STUDY WORKGROUP MEETINGS/ WORKGROUP MEMBER REPORTS/REVIEW AND FURTHER DISCUSSION OF OPTIONS MATRIX/OTHER COA MEMBER OBSERVATIONS

Consultants Cheryl Hickey and Teri Clark presented this item. Teri Clark reviewed the matrix which is updated after each meeting of the Accreditation Study Workgroup. A separate matrix will be created reflecting the comments and suggestions of the COA. The COA was informed that the Purpose of Accreditation language will be distributed to stakeholders one more time for field review prior to “solidifying” the language. In reflecting upon the role of the Commission and the COA, it was agreed that there should be more communication between the COA and the Commission regarding the accreditation process and that communication could be improved if COA representatives attended additional Commission meetings as appropriate. Unit Accreditation and Program Approval was discussed, with Option 3 (development of a new blended system which addresses both unit accreditation and program approval in a different manner) being the agreed upon option by the COA. It was the consensus that Option 3 ensures that programs will be thoroughly reviewed and that any questionable issues will be brought to the front at the time of the review. Regarding the topic of Accreditation Decisions, the suggestion was made that the COA have the ability to require follow-up by the institution being reviewed, even if they have been granted accreditation without any stipulations.

Additional discussion was held regarding Program Standard Options and the Accreditation Workgroup’s preliminary consensus of providing three options. It was agreed that clearer standards for the Experimental/Alternative Programs are needed. The present standards are quite old and in need of revision. There was group consensus that either Option 2 (the three program standard options) or Option 3 be used, with the inclusion that Option 3 contain the language, *All institutions to use 1) California or 2) National or Professional Program Standards if deemed comparable.* Lynne Cook will route this information to members of the Accreditation Study Workgroup for informal discussion.

The COA agreed with the workgroup that National Unit Accreditation should be continued as it is currently defined in the Accreditation Framework. In reviewing the topic of National Program Approval or Accreditation, the COA felt that California programs should participate in the California process, even if they are aligned with National accreditation.

Discussion next centered around the collection of data with the emphasis on Option J, the option endorsed by the Accreditation Workgroup. Option J requires an annual report to be submitted by each program to the Commission. The year 3 report is to be reviewed by a 2 person panel and 18 months prior to the site visit a full self study is prepared, in which all programs are reviewed. A report on the program review will be presented to the COA. The unit will then be reviewed in a three day site visit. Programs that had been previously reviewed on paper that raised questions may be further studied at the site visit. This method provides reduced site visit costs, although cost to the institution may be initially increased due to the greater frequency of reporting. This would be offset, however, by the reduced cost of the site visit. There would be greater frequency in the monitoring of the programs with the addition of the requested annual reports. The COA felt that this method called for more careful monitoring of programs and requested that program decisions not be finalized until the site visit. It was also suggested by Sue Teele that this option would have to be very carefully presented to the field so as not to give an overabundance of additional work. Irma Guzman Wagner stated that requesting a bi-annual report would be a more realistic implementation of Option J and would not call for additional work in the absence of resources. Fred Baker added that it is essential that institutions see “the big picture” and that they need to be aware that the annual reports will serve as a progression of data to be presented to the Commission. This method will provide more interaction between the institutions and the COA over time. It was also mentioned that there won’t be more money or resources made available to programs in the near future and that we need to be sensitive in presenting this option to the field. Ruth Sandlin suggested that annual reporting would be made easier if there was a template provided into which institutions could just plug in the annual data. Lynne Cook added that the vision of Option J was that the annual report be submitted on line. COA could then appoint a team of 3 BIR reviewers to review the reports at home. There were questions about time for reflection. Many members of the COA felt that in using an annual report, by the time the first reporting cycle was done, programs would already be working on the next report. Consultant Teri Clark advised the COA that this method allows programs to see ongoing changes over time. The importance of training at all levels was also stressed. Ed Kujawa asked whether this approach was similar to the accreditation process of other professions. Cheryl Hickey, Consultant, offered to provide information relating how other professions monitor members/programs between site visits at the April meeting of the COA.

A transition plan, reflecting a graduated transition to a new reporting system, was discussed and will be added to the matrix. The transition plan would consist of a template to be used. The first year, the institution would submit information but no summary. The data for year two would include new data, an assessment result and unit summary, lending itself to more of a “tiered system”. It was strongly suggested that the Interim Activity be renamed. This activity would call for a revised program document which would be used by the reviewers who would meet in one regional area to review reports for adherence to standards. It was suggested that the institutions provide self-selected information in their interim report, and that they should have some choices in what they choose to report on. This method would give the institution an opportunity to personalize its report, but would not take the place of annual data. This would allow the institutions to address concerns while still keeping commonality in the reporting. Based on this, the nature of the site visit would be changed, allowing the program reviewer to be more focused in his/her review.

COA concerns will be brought back to the Accreditation Study Workgroup. The COA stated that although they are closer, they have not reached alignment with the Accreditation Workgroup. Members of the COA also agreed that the visit to the Accreditation Study Workgroup on the day prior to the COA meeting was very beneficial.

REPORT OF COA SUB-GROUP MEETINGS, DISCUSSION ABOUT COA DATA, DISCUSSION ON USE OF HISTORICAL DATA

This item was presented by a subgroup of the Committee, consisting of Lynne Cook, Ruth Sandlin, Sue Teele, Dana Griggs and Fred Baker. Discussion centered around the selection process of the COA. It was agreed that, due to recent budgetary limitations and protracted member terms, the selection process of COA members has fallen into disarray. It was proposed that in the future there should be a larger number of alternates, possibly rank ordered, and that the nomination process should be streamlined and should be as non-political as possible in order to get good candidates.

Consensus was reached that the nominating panel should consist of two COA members, one representing higher education and one representing K-12, and two Commission members. The Commission will select two nominating panel members and the COA will also select two. These nominating panel members can be members of the COA, Commission members, or can from outside areas related to education. It was also suggested that members of the COA will serve four year terms, with new members being given a tight, focused training.

The discussion of use of historical data was introduced by another sub-group of the Committee, consisting of Ed Kujawa, Irma Guzman Wagner, Diane Doe, Donna Uyemoto and David Madrigal. The group stressed the need for required follow-up in order to assure continuous improvement. It was suggested that the focus remain on the Unit and Common Standards and that required follow-up be allowed at all accredited institutions, not just those receiving stipulations. The COA found that most of the group's suggestions were aligned with those covered by Option 7 of the Accreditation chart.

REVIEW OF DRAFT ACCREDITATION DECISION OPTIONS

Administrator, Larry Birch presented this item. After discussion of the item, the COA made decisions about the options. There was a consensus that for each standard there will be one of three options: Meets the Standard; Meets the Standard with Concerns; and Does Not Meet the Standard. For each program area, the team report will contain a summary indicating one of the following: All Program Standards Met; One or More Program Standards Less Than Fully Met; One or More Program Standards Less Than Fully Met, with Required Follow-up; and One or More Program Standards Not Met With Required Follow-up. The stipulation terminology will be changed to Minor (instead of Technical) Stipulation(s), Major (instead of Substantive) Stipulation(s) and Critical (instead of Probationary) Stipulation(s). Both under Common Standards and Program Standards, the phrase Standard Not Met will be changed to Does Not Meet the Standard.

The terminology for use when the COA would require institutions or districts to report back about changes made would be changed from Accreditation with Required Follow-Up to Accreditation: Follow-up Required. The COA also agreed that when the team has determined there is a Critical Stipulation, a plan to remedy is to be provided to the Committee by the institution within three months of the COA action.

DISCUSSION OF ALTERNATIVE FUNDING MECHANISMS FOR ACCREDITATION

Consultants Cheryl Hickey and Teri Clark led the COA in a discussion of various funding mechanisms that could be used for accreditation activities. Several options were discussed, including a restoration of the credential fee to what it previously was. No consensus was reached about which of the options might be preferable. It was requested that staff provide a cost analysis to the COA of what accreditation review costs are per institution, in order to better ascertain how the burden of costs is spread.

RECESSED

The meeting was recessed at 4:35 p.m. by Dana Griggs and reconvened at 8:30 a.m. on January 28, 2005.

REPORT OF PROGRAM AND INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Administrator, Larry Birch presented the items in this report.

Programs of Professional Preparation for the Multiple and Single Subject Credentials – SB 2042 Program Review

It was moved, seconded (Teele/OConnor) and carried to grant initial accreditation to the following programs of professional preparation:

Argosy University

Multiple Subject Credential

Multiple Subject (BCLAD Emphasis – Spanish)

Single Subject Credential

Single Subject (BCLAD Emphasis – Spanish)

William Jessup University

Multiple Subject Credential

Programs of Professional Preparation for the Bilingual and Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) Emphasis

It was moved, seconded (Baker/Teele) and carried to grant initial accreditation to the following programs of professional preparation:

California State University, Bakersfield
Multiple Subject BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)

California State University, Hayward
(School name changed to California State University, East Bay, January 26, 2005)
Multiple Subject BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)

San Jose State University
Multiple Subject BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish, Vietnamese)

Blended Programs of Subject Matter Preparation and Professional Preparation for the Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs

It was moved, seconded (Guzman Wagner/Madrigal) and carried to grant initial accreditation to the following programs of professional preparation:

California State University, Chico
Physical Education/Single Subject

California State University, Los Angeles
Science/Single Subject

Program(s) of Professional Preparation for the Fifth Year of Study

It was moved, seconded (Sandlin/OConnor) and carried (Baker and Griggs recused) to grant initial accreditation to the following fifth year programs:

Azusa Pacific University

Biola University

California Baptist University

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

It was moved, seconded (Sandlin/Guzman Wagner) and carried to grant initial accreditation to the following fifth year programs:

California State University, Fullerton

California State University, Hayward
(School name changed to California State University, East Bay, January 26, 2005)

California State University, Long Beach

Chapman University – Orange Campus

Chapman University – University Campus

Christian Heritage College

Fresno Pacific University

Loyola Marymount University

National Hispanic University

Notre Dame de Namur University

San Diego State University

Vanguard University

University of Redlands

University of California, Los Angeles, Center X

It was moved, seconded (Madrigal/Guzman Wagner) and carried (Kujawa recused) to grant initial accreditation to the following fifth year program:

Dominican University

It was moved, seconded (Madrigal/Baker) and carried (Teele recused) to grant initial accreditation to the following fifth year program:

University of California, Riverside, Extension Program

Program(s) of Professional Preparation for the Bilingual Specialist Credential

It was moved, seconded (Teele/Guzman Wagner) and carried to grant initial accreditation to the following program of professional preparation:

San Diego State University

Program(s) of Professional Preparation for the Education Specialist Credential

It was moved, seconded (OConnor/Teele) and carried to grant initial accreditation to the following programs of professional preparation:

California Baptist University

Preliminary Level I

Moderate/Severe Disabilities

Moderate/Severe Disabilities with Internship Option I

Touro University

Preliminary Level I

Mild/Moderate Disabilities

Mild/Moderate Disabilities with Internship Option I

San Joaquin County Office of Education

Preliminary Level I

Moderate/Severe Disabilities District Internship Program

Programs of Professional Preparation for the Administrative Services Credential

It was moved, seconded (Teele/Guzman Wagner) and carried to grant initial accreditation to the following programs of professional preparation:

University of La Verne

Professional

Programs of Professional Preparation for the Pupil Personnel Services Credential

It was moved, seconded (Madrigal/OConnor) and carried to grant initial accreditation to the following programs of professional preparation:

California State University, Long Beach

School Social Work

Child Welfare and Attendance

California State University, Sacramento

School Counseling

School Counseling Internship

Phillips Graduate Institute

Child Welfare and Attendance

San Francisco State University

School Psychology

School Psychology Internship

Programs of Professional Preparation for the Reading and Language Arts Specialist

It was moved, seconded (Guzman Wagner/Teele) and carried to grant initial accreditation to the following program of professional preparation:

University of California, Irvine
Reading Certificate

Recommendation Regarding Removal of Accreditation Stipulations and Change of Accreditation Status for San Diego State University

It was moved, seconded (Kujawa/Guzman Wagner) and carried on the basis of an accreditation follow-up review to remove the technical stipulations placed upon San Diego State University by the Committee on Accreditation, and to change the accreditation status of San Diego State University from "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations" to "Accreditation".

REPORT OF THE ACCREDITATION VISIT TO CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES

Larry Birch, Administrator, gave an overview of the merged COA/NCATE accreditation visit to California State University, Los Angeles which took place November 6-10, 2004. He introduced Team Leader, Jim Richmond, who presented the accreditation team report and answered questions. The Dean of the Charter College of Education, Carol Bartell, was present to represent the institution.

It was moved, seconded (Teele/Doe) and carried to make the following accreditation decisions for California State University, Los Angeles based upon the Accreditation Team Report, team recommendations and staff recommendations:

1. The decision for California State University, Los Angeles is ACCREDITATION.

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Adapted Physical Education Credential
- Administrative Services Credential
 - Preliminary Credential
 - Preliminary Internship
 - Professional Credential
- Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential
 - Language, Speech and Hearing
 - Audiology
 - Special Class Authorization
 - Orientation and Mobility

- Education Specialist Credentials
 - Preliminary Level I
 - Early Childhood Special Education
 - Early Childhood Special Education Internship
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship
 - Physical and Health Impairments
 - Physical and Health Impairments Internship
 - Visual Impairments
 - Visual Impairments Internship
 - Blended Program – Mild/Moderate Disabilities,
Moderate/Severe Disabilities/Elementary Subject Matter
 - Professional Level II
 - Early Childhood Special Education
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities
 - Physical and Health Impairments
 - Visual Impairments
- Health Services (School Nurse) Credential
- Multiple Subject Credential
 - Multiple Subject Credential
 - Multiple Subject Internship
 - BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish, Cantonese, Mandarin)
 - Blended Program/Elementary Subject Matter
- Pupil Personnel Services Credential
 - School Counseling
 - School Counseling Internship
 - School Psychology
 - School Psychology Internship
 - Child Welfare and Attendance
- Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential
 - Reading Certificate
 - Reading and Language Arts Specialist
- Resource Specialist Certificate
- Single Subject Credential
 - Single Subject Credential
 - Single Subject Internship
 - BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
 - Blended Program/Science

2. In addition:

- The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted
- California State University, Los Angeles is permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
- California State University, Los Angeles is placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2011-2012 academic year subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation visits by both the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

REPORT OF THE ACCREDITATION VISIT TO THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO

Phil Fitch, Consultant, gave an overview of the merged COA/NCATE accreditation visit to the University of San Diego which took place October 23-27, 2004. He introduced Team Leader, Joel Colbert, who presented the accreditation team report and answered questions. Dean of the School of Education, Paula Cordeiro, was present to represent the institution.

Because the University of San Diego received accreditation by the COA in 2002, this was an information item and no change to the accreditation status of the University of San Diego was made. The state team members took part in the pre-scheduled NCATE accreditation visit because of the partnership with NCATE.

DEBRIEF OF ACCREDITATION DECISION-MAKING ACTIVITIES

Fred Baker reflected upon how easy the job of the COA becomes when reports are well written. He stated that the reports presented at this meeting were of a better quality and included more information than in the past, leading the COA in a new direction. David Madrigal added that the use of tables in the merged reports looked good, but that institutions need to address what is on the table rather than just spoken to. Irma Guzman Wagner mentioned that a program summary like the one provided by the University of San Diego could be very useful in making comments on the accreditation decision. Dana Griggs stated that this meeting validates her opinion that the Accreditation Study Group and the COA are moving in the right direction. Ed Kujawa added that in reflecting upon the past four days, it was made apparent that the BIR members need additional training in this type of writing. He suggested the use of templates and mandatory page limitation as good ideas to keep the COA from receiving overly lengthy reports. Sue Teele concurred with limiting the report length. She stated that reports need to be tightened up to prevent information overkill. Ruth Sandlin reminded the COA that the reason the reports presented at this meeting were so large is because they are following the NCATE report template.

DECISION OF HOW TO PRESENT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ACCREDITATION STUDY WORKGROUP, DISCUSSION OF AREAS OF CONSENSUS AND PROCESS FOR REPORTING AREAS IN WHICH CONSENSUS NOT OBTAINED

Agreement on the method of member selection to the COA was reached. It was agreed that the term of appointment of COA members be four years. A selection process would be held each year, with three new COA members and three alternates chosen. In addition to providing a list of alternates that is updated yearly, this selection process will also bring the COA in front of the Commission each year. The selection process would also result in a lowering of costs as there would be fewer nominations to screen if done on an annual basis. The suggestion was made that nominee interviews could be held as part of a regular meeting of the Commission. Staff could consult with current members of the COA in order to determine those willing to continue as members during the transition, and those three who wish to end their terms on the COA with the selection of the first three new members.

In determining how to present information, consensus, and recommendations to the Commission, the COA agreed that their recommendations to the Commission should not be presented all at once, or in a “package” format. It was agreed that before the final recommendations are presented to the Commission, there should be one or more earlier presentations to the Commission indicating areas of preliminary consensus between the COA and Accreditation Study Workgroup to give the Commission an idea of how the process is moving and provide an opportunity for the Commission to provide direction. The intent is to bring the Commission along as the recommendations are being finalized.

There was also agreement that both COA and Accreditation Study Workgroup members should jointly present the recommended changes in accreditation policies to the Commission. Co-Chairs of the Accreditation Study Workgroup and other members of the ASWG will be invited to the April 21 COA meeting.

In reviewing items on the matrix prepared by Consultant, Teri Clark, the following was agreed upon: Both Elementary Subject Matter Programs, Single Subject Matter Programs, and Blended Programs will be revisited by the Accreditation Study Workgroup after March. At present, Commission staff is receiving feedback on the Fifth Year recommendations. The Specialized Credential topics have been temporarily placed on hold by the Accreditation Study Workgroup until March or later. Designated Subjects programs would continue to be reviewed through the accreditation process.

Another item for consideration is the Accreditation Study Workgroup recommendation to the COA that the concept of required elements under SB2042 be revisited. It was recommended that a group other than the current Accreditation Study Workgroup review on a standard by standard basis to determine what would be lost if the required 2042 elements were eliminated. Although there is general support among the ASWG members that the required elements are “too prescriptive,” there is also the possibility that key concepts or ideas may be lost, if they were eliminated. Therefore, there is a need for a more careful look at the implications of any move in this direction. Breadth and flexibility of the standards should also be addressed. Experimental and alternative program standards should also to be reviewed and revised by a separate group.

It was agreed that a revised BIR training process would need to be developed by the COA after the new accreditation system is selected.

ADJOURNMENT

Dana Griggs, Co-Chair, adjourned the meeting of the Committee on Accreditation at 12:20 p.m. on Friday, January 28, 2005.

Attachment

Accreditation Decision-making Options

(Revised after COA Discussion – January 2005)

Decision Guidelines About Standards (assuming required elements)

For each standard there will be one of three options:

- **Meets the Standard**
All of the elements of the standard are present and effectively implemented.
- **Meets the Standard with Concerns**
All of the elements of the standard are present, but the quality of one or more of the elements is inadequate. Of the elements of the standard, one or more may be ineffectively or inadequately addressed.
- **Does Not Meet the Standard**
There are elements specifically mentioned in the standard that are missing. The cluster will identify in writing any of those elements.

or

On balance, based on the evidence received, the institution or program has not effectively addressed and implemented the standard.

In all cases where a standard is “met with concerns” or “not met,” the cluster will provide specific information about the deficiency and the rationale for its judgment. In cases where the team recommends required follow-up, the cluster will provide specific directions for follow-up actions and the rationale for its recommendation.

Development and Format of the Accreditation Team Report

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members will receive copies of the accreditation standards being used by the institution, copies of the appropriate parts of the Institutional Self-Study Report, forms to assist in the review of documents and instructions from Commission staff on preparations for the visit. Team members will be asked to carefully read the institution's response to each standard and develop questions they plan to ask during the visit.

The team meets on the afternoon before the visit (usually Sunday) for organizational activities and specific training for the visit. Cluster members are instructed to gather information on each standard relevant to that cluster and the cluster will make a specific determination about each standard. The cluster will be provided with internal tracking forms to use that list each standard required for the Institutional Self-Study Report. The Team Leader will have copies of the internal tracking forms for all clusters and will be responsible to see that each cluster gives the required consideration to each standard.

For the **Common Standards**, a specific finding about each standard will be included in the Accreditation Team Report, along with a narrative explaining the basis for the finding. Deficiencies in standards may be confined to a particular program, or they may apply across all programs. The team may identify specific deficiencies for which there will be **Required Follow-up** within 12 months of the accreditation action. For each Common Standard there will be an opportunity in the report to note particular **Strengths** beyond the narrative supporting the finding on the standard and an opportunity to note particular **Concerns** beyond the narrative supporting the finding on the standard. The team may also choose to make **Professional Comments** about one or more of the Common Standards that will be added at the end of the report and are only for consideration by the institution. The Professional Comments are non-binding on the institution. (See Accreditation Standards Summary – Common Standards)

As required in the *Accreditation Framework*, for each program area, the team will make a decision about the **Program Standards**, using the above decision options. The team will keep a record about each standard, but there will not be a standard by standard report in the Accreditation Team Report. One section of each program report will be for **Findings on Standards**. At that point the narrative will describe any program standards which are “met with concerns” or “not met” and the basis for that determination. The team may identify specific deficiencies for which there will be **Required Follow-up** within 12 months of the accreditation action. If all standards are fully met, a statement to that effect will be included along with a basis for that determination. Where appropriate, the team may indicate if particular standards have been met with distinction. As in the Common Standards report, the team has the opportunity to note particular **Strengths** beyond the narrative supporting the findings on the standards and an opportunity to note **Concerns** not rising to the level of finding a standard less than fully met. Also, as in the Common Standards report, the team may also choose to make **Professional Comments** about the program that will be added at the end of the report and are only for consideration by the institution. The Professional Comments are non-binding on the institution. (See Accreditation Standards Summary – Program Standards)

For each program area, the report will contain a summary of the findings indicating one the following:

- All Program Standards Met
- One or more Program Standards less than fully Met
- One or more Program Standards less than fully Met, with Required Follow-up
- One of more Program Standards Not Met with Required Follow-up

Accreditation Decision

After the report is written, the entire team meets on the third morning for a final discussion of the report and a decision about the results of the visit. The discussion will center on which accreditation decision would be appropriate for the institution: **Accreditation, Accreditation Follow-up Required, Accreditation with Stipulations or Denial of Accreditation**. When the team recommends stipulations, the team drafts each recommended stipulation and specifically indicates the type of institutional action and evidence needed to remove the stipulation. The team will also recommend to the Committee on Accreditation whether the stipulations should be considered to be **Minor, Major or Critical**. Once the team decision is made, a final copy of the Accreditation Team Report is prepared and duplicated. The Accreditation Team then conducts

an exit interview with representatives of the institution, at which time the team presents its findings and recommendations in the form of a draft Accreditation Team Report which will be presented at a later date to the Committee on Accreditation.

Accreditation Team Recommendations

ACCREDITATION

The team recommendation of **Accreditation** is defined as verifying that the program sponsor in question has demonstrated that, when judged as a whole, it meets or exceeds the Common and Program Standards as selected by the sponsor pursuant to the options listed in the *Accreditation Framework*. The sponsor (including its credential programs) is judged to be effective in preparing educators and is demonstrating overall quality in its programs and general operations. The accreditation team makes a professional judgment about the program sponsor (and its programs.) The status of **Accreditation** can be achieved even if there are one or two Common standards identified as not fully met or some program standards not met or not fully met.

Operational Implications

A program sponsor that receives the status of **Accreditation** is permitted to continue all accredited credential programs until the next accreditation site visit and to propose new credential programs to the Committee on Accreditation at any time. The sponsor is not required to make additional reports to the Committee on Accreditation and is not obligated to respond to any recommendations made by the accreditation team in its report or comments made by the Committee on Accreditation in its deliberations. The program sponsor is required to abide by all Commission and state regulations. The sponsor may indicate in all publications and documents its continuing accreditation status and the Committee on Accreditation will note its status in the Committee's annual report to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

ACCREDITATION: FOLLOW-UP REQUIRED

The team recommendation of **Accreditation: Follow-up Required** is defined as verifying that the program sponsor in question has demonstrated that, when judged as a whole, it meets or exceeds the Common and Program Standards as selected by the sponsor pursuant to the options listed in the *Accreditation Framework*. The sponsor (including its credential programs) is judged to be effective in preparing educators and is demonstrating overall quality in its programs and general operations. The accreditation team makes a professional judgment about the program sponsor (and its programs.) The status of **Accreditation: Follow-up Required** can be achieved even if there are one or two Common standards identified as not fully met or some program standards not met or not fully met. The program sponsor is required to provide satisfactory follow-up information (as specified by the accreditation team) to the Committee on Accreditation within one year of the date of the COA action. Required follow-up may be for unit-wide standards issues, or can be limited to one or more program areas.

Operational Implications

A program sponsor that receives the status of **Accreditation: Follow-up Required** is permitted to continue all accredited credential programs until the next accreditation site visit and to propose

new credential programs to the Committee on Accreditation at any time. The sponsor is required to make the appropriate report or reports to the Committee on Accreditation within the specified timelines. The program sponsor is required to abide by all Commission and state regulations. The sponsor may indicate in all publications and documents its continuing accreditation status and the Committee on Accreditation will note its status in the Committee's annual report to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

ACCREDITATION WITH STIPULATIONS

Note: This accreditation status is sub-divided into three parts -- **Accreditation with Minor Stipulations**, **Accreditation with Major Stipulations** and **Accreditation with Critical Stipulations**.

Accreditation with Minor Stipulations

The recommendation of **Accreditation with Minor Stipulations** by an accreditation team is defined as verifying that the program sponsor has been found by the team to have some Common Standards or Program Standards not met or not fully met. However, the concerns or problems are of primarily of a technical nature (defined as operational, administrative, or procedural concerns or problems). The sponsor is determined to have overall quality and effectiveness in its credential programs and general operations apart from the identified technical matters.

Operational Implications

A program sponsor that receives the status of **Accreditation with Minor Stipulations** is permitted to continue all accredited credential programs until the next accreditation site visit and to propose new credential programs to the Committee on Accreditation at any time. The sponsor is required to respond to all minor stipulations noted by the Committee on Accreditation and to prepare a written report with appropriate documentation that all stipulations have been removed. This report is to be sent to the Committee on Accreditation within one calendar year of the visit. The Committee on Accreditation may ask the accreditation team chair or a Commission consultant to verify the accuracy and completeness of the response. Typically, a re-visit to the campus by a team member or Commission consultant is not necessary for this accreditation decision. The program sponsor is required to abide by all Commission and state regulations. The institution may indicate in all publications and documents its continuing accreditation status and the Committee on Accreditation will note its status in the Committee's annual report to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation with Major Stipulations

The recommendation of **Accreditation with Major Stipulations** by an accreditation team is defined as verifying that the program sponsor has been found by the team to have significant deficiencies in Common Standards or Program Standards, or areas of concern that are tied to matters of curriculum, field experience, or candidate competence. The team may identify other issues that impinge on the ability of the institution to deliver programs of quality and effectiveness. The institution may be determined to have quality and effectiveness in some of its credential programs and general operations but these areas of quality do not outweigh the identified areas of concern.

Operational Implications

A program sponsor receiving a recommendation of **Accreditation with Major Stipulations** is permitted to continue all approved credential programs for a period of one calendar year. The Committee on Accreditation considers if the sponsor should be given permission to propose new programs of professional preparation or expand existing programs, or if limitations should be placed on affected programs. The program sponsor may be required to notify students of its accreditation status. The notification could be limited to students in a particular program or could apply to all students. The sponsor is required to respond to all substantive stipulations noted by the Committee on Accreditation by preparing a written report with appropriate documentation demonstrating that all stipulations have been removed and to prepare for a focused re-visit by an accreditation team (or in some cases, Commission staff). The program sponsor will work with the original consultant to plan the re-visit that will address the stated concerns of the original accreditation team. The report of the re-visit team is to be received and acted upon by the Committee on Accreditation within one calendar year of the original visit.

The program sponsor is required to abide by all Commission and state regulations. The sponsor may indicate in all publications and documents its continuing accreditation status and the Committee on Accreditation will note its status in the Committee's annual report to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Once all stipulations are removed, the program sponsor is granted **Accreditation** and is permitted to continue all accredited credential programs until the next scheduled accreditation site visit and to propose new credential programs to the Committee on Accreditation at any time. The sponsor will notify its constituency of its change of accreditation status as it sees fit.

Accreditation with Critical Stipulations

The recommendation of **Accreditation with Critical Stipulations** by an accreditation team is defined as verifying that the program sponsor has been found by the team to have serious deficiencies in Common Standards or Program Standards, or significant areas of concern that are tied to matters of curriculum, field experience, or candidate competence. The team may identify other issues that are preventing the sponsor from delivering programs of quality and effectiveness. The program sponsor may be determined to have quality and effectiveness in some of its credential programs and general operations but these areas of quality do not outweigh the identified areas of concern. A probationary stipulation may require that a severely deficient program be discontinued.

Operational Implications

A program sponsor receiving a recommendation of **Accreditation with Critical Stipulations** is permitted to continue all accredited credential programs for a period of one calendar year. The sponsor may not propose new programs of professional preparation or expand existing programs. Limitations may be placed on affected programs. The program sponsor must provide a “Plan to Remedy” to the Committee on Accreditation within three months of COA action. The program sponsor is required to notify students of its accreditation status. The notification could be limited to students in a particular program or could apply to all students at the institution. The sponsor is required to respond to all probationary stipulations noted by the Committee on Accreditation by preparing a written report with appropriate documentation demonstrating that all stipulations have been removed and to prepare for a focused re-visit by an accreditation team. The program sponsor will work with the original consultant to plan the re-visit that will address the stated concerns of the original accreditation team. The report of the re-visit team is to be received and acted upon by the Committee on Accreditation within one calendar year of the original visit.

In cases where a team recommends that a severely deficient program be discontinued, the Committee on Accreditation may require the program sponsor to file a plan for discontinuation within 60 days of the original visit. That plan must address the needs of current students and provide evidence that the sponsor will admit no students after the end of the semester or quarter in which the original visit occurred.

The program sponsor is required to abide by all Commission and state regulations. The Committee on Accreditation will note its status in the Committee's annual report to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. If all stipulations are removed within the year, the institution is granted **Accreditation** and is permitted to continue all accredited credential programs until the next scheduled accreditation site visit and to propose new credential programs to the Committee on Accreditation at any time. On some occasions the Committee on Accreditation will continue stipulations for an additional period of time when significant progress has been made, but additional time is needed to remedy the deficiencies identified earlier. In the event that the program sponsor does not respond appropriately to the probationary stipulations according to the timeline, the sponsor is brought back to the Committee on Accreditation for consideration of **Denial of Accreditation**.

DENIAL OF ACCREDITATION

The recommendation of **Denial of Accreditation** by an accreditation team is defined as the removal of authority for operating accredited credential programs by that particular program sponsor because the team has found compelling evidence that the sponsor has routinely ignored or violated the Common Standards and Program Standards to the level that the competence of the individuals being recommended for credentials is in serious question. The program sponsor is determined not to have minimal quality and effectiveness in its credential programs and general operations. A recommendation for **Denial of Accreditation** occurs when the team has evidence that closing all credential programs and requiring an interim planning and re-structuring period is the most viable solution to the problems encountered.

If an accreditation team is conducting a re-visit to a program sponsor that had received substantive or probationary stipulations as a result of a previous accreditation visit and the re-

visit team finds that the stipulations have not been removed, the re-visit team must, according to the *Accreditation Framework*, recommend **Denial of Accreditation**. The Committee on Accreditation may, if requested by the program sponsor, permit an additional period to remedy severe deficiencies if the Committee finds (a) substantial progress has been and/or (b) special circumstances described by the sponsor justify a delay.

Operational Implications

A program sponsor receiving **Denial of Accreditation** would be required to take immediate steps to close all credential programs at the end of the semester or quarter in which the Committee on Accreditation decision took place. The sponsor would be required to file a plan of discontinuation within 90 days of the Committee's decision. The plan would give information and assurances regarding the efforts of the sponsor to place currently enrolled students in other programs or to provide adequate assistance to permit students to complete their particular program.

The program sponsor will be required to announce that it has had its accreditation for educator preparation withdrawn. The sponsor would be enjoined from re-applying for accreditation (COA) for two years and would be required to make a formal application to the Committee on Accreditation which would include the submission of a complete self study report including responses to the Commons Standards and Program Standards. The self-study must show clearly how the program sponsor has attended to all problems noted in the accreditation team report that recommended **Denial of Accreditation**. The Committee on Accreditation would make a decision on the status of the sponsor. If the Committee grants initial accreditation to the program sponsor and its programs, a full accreditation visit will be scheduled within two years.

Accreditation Standards Summary

(Revised after COA Discussion – January 2005)

Common Standards

Common Standard Number	Standard Met	Standard Met: Follow-up Required	Standard Met with Concerns	Standard Met with Concerns: Follow-up Required	Standard Not Met: Follow-up Required
1.					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					
7.					
8.					

Program Standards

Program Name	All Program Standards Met	All Program Standards Met: Follow-up Required	One or More Program Standards Less than Fully Met	One or More Program Standards Less than Fully Met: Follow-up Required	One or More Program Standards Not Met: Follow-up Required
Multiple Subject					
Single Subject					
Education Specialist					
Admin. Services					
Pupil Pers. Services					
Read. Lang. Arts Spec.					
Etc.					